UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA

JOHN ROBERT LEE,)	
VS.	Plaintiff,)	1:06-cv-105-SEB-VSS
CRAIG HANKS, et al.,)	
	Defendants.)	

ENTRY

- 1. The plaintiff's motion for leave to file an amended complaint, filed on September 28, 2006, is **granted** to the extent that the complaint filed on January 20, 2006, is **amended by interlineation** to reflect that each defendant is sued in his individual capacity. The plaintiff's motion for leave to file an amended complaint, filed on September 28, 2006, is denied as unnecessary to the extent that the filing of a separate document is necessary to effectuate the foregoing.
- 2. The foregoing also makes clear, however, that the plaintiff cannot obtain the injunctive relief he seeks in this action. This is because injunctive relief can only be obtained from a defendant in his or her official capacity, for it is only in that sense in which a defendant individual could supply the requested relief. *Lenea v. Lane*, 882 F.2d 1171, 1179 (7th Cir. 1989).
- 3. The claim for injunctive relief is therefore **dismissed as legally insufficient.** This dismissal is compelled by 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(b). See *Lagerstrom V. Kingston*, 2006 WL 2567516 (7th Cir. September 28, 2006); *Sanders v. Sheahan*, 198 F.3d 626 (7th Cir. 1999).
- 4. Because the plaintiff seeks only injunctive relief and because that claim has now been dismissed, the action shall also be **dismissed**, and judgment consistent with this Entry shall now issue.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

		Sandy Carous Barker
Date:	10/02/2006	SARAH EVANS BARKER, JUDGE United States District Court Southern District of Indiana